



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/816,267	03/31/2004	John P. Brizek	1020.P18413	9827
57035	7590	07/23/2008	EXAMINER	
KACVINSKY LLC			PAN, JOSEPH T	
C/O INTELLEVATE				
P.O. BOX 52050			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			2135	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/23/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/816,267	BRIZEK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JOSEPH PAN	2135	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2008.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,3-9,11-15,17-20 and 22 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,3-9,11-15,17-20 and 22 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 31 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 30, 2008 has been entered.

2. Applicant's response filed on April 30, 2008 has been carefully considered. Claims 1, 7, 9, 15, and 20 have been amended. Claims 1, 3-9, 11-15, 17-20 and 22 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3-9, 11-15, 17-20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,069,439 B1), hereinafter "Chen", in view of Nakayama et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0147251 A1), hereinafter "Nakayama".

Referring to claims 1, 7, 15, 20:

i. Chen teaches:

A method, comprising:

dynamically generating a first set of integrity information for a first processing system by generating said first set of integrity information for an application using a cryptographic algorithm (see figure 5, elements 530 'generate digest', 570 'compare metrics'; column 4, line 59-column 5, line 2; column 8, lines 4-16; and column 11, lines 5-16 of Chen);

sending said first set of integrity information to a second processing system (see figure 5, elements 535 'sign & return digest' of Chen); and

generating an attestation value for said first processing system by said second processing system using said first set of integrity information and a dynamic attestation module connected to said second processing system prior to execution of said application by said first processing system (see column 11, lines 5-16, '...compares the computed integrity metrics, which it extracts from the challenge response, with the proper platform integrity metric, which it extracts from the certificate.); and figure 5, element 590 'establish secure communication', of Chen, emphasis added).

Chen discloses dynamic authentication of the platform and application (see column 8, lines 4-16, particularly "Other know processes, for example virus checkers, will typically be in place to check that the operating system and application program code has not been subverted", of Chen, emphasis added).

However, Chen does not specifically mention selecting an application from a plurality of applications.

ii. Nakayama teaches a portable terminal wherein Nakayama discloses selecting an application from a plurality of applications (see figure 5, element 222 'service identifier area' [i.e., a plurality of applications]; page 7, paragraph [0102], lines 9-12 "The service identifier area 222 stores identifiers of services (e.g., "0001", "0002", "0003",...) for which the corresponding value entities in the value entity area 221

are used"; and paragraph [0098], lines 7-9 "or pull-type transmission in which the store server 30 transmits the application in response to an active transmission request from the portable terminal 20", of Nakayama).

iii. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Nakayama into the method of Chen to select an application from a plurality of applications for authentication.

iv. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to have applied the teaching of Nakayama into the system of Chen to select an application from a plurality of applications for authentication, because Chen teaches dynamic authentication of platform and applications (see column 8, lines 4-16 of Chen), and Nakayama teaches selection an application from a plurality of applications (see ii above). Therefore, Nakayama's teaching could enhance Chen's system by providing more flexibility.

Referring to claims 3, 22:

Chen and Nakayama teach the claimed subject matter: a method for performing dynamic attestation (see claim 1 above). Chen further discloses

retrieving a second set of integrity information for said first processing system (see column 11, lines 5-16, '...compares the computed integrity metrics, which it extracts from the challenge response, with the proper platform integrity metric, which it extracts from the certificate.', of Chen, emphasis added);

comparing said first set of integrity information with said second set of integrity information (see column 11, lines 5-16 of Chen); and

generating said attestation value in accordance with said comparison (see column 11, lines 5-16 of Chen).

Referring to claim 4:

Chen and Nakayama teach the claimed subject matter: a method for performing dynamic attestation (see claim 1 above). Chen further discloses the encryption key (see column 4, lines 56-58 of Chen).

Referring to claims 5, 19:

Chen and Nakayama teach the claimed subject matter: a method for performing dynamic attestation (see claim 1 above). Chen further discloses the authentication (see column 7, lines 21-26 of Chen).

Referring to claim 6:

Chen and Nakayama teach the claimed subject matter: a method for performing dynamic attestation (see claim 1 above). Chen further discloses the decryption (see column 7, lines 21-26 of Chen).

Referring to claim 8:

Chen and Nakayama teach the claimed subject matter: a method for performing dynamic attestation (see claim 7 above). Chen further discloses the first and the second process (see figure 5, ‘trusted device’, ‘user’ [i.e., smart card] of Chen).

Referring to claim 17:

Chen and Nakayama teach the claimed subject matter: a method for performing dynamic attestation (see claim 15 above). Chen further discloses retrieving a second set of integrity information (see column 11, lines 5-16 ‘...with the proper platform integrity metric, which is extracts from the certificate.’, of Chen).

Referring to claim 18:

Chen and Nakayama teach the claimed subject matter: a method for performing dynamic attestation (see claim 15 above). Chen further discloses comparing the first set of integrity metric with the second set of integrity metric (see column 11, lines 5-16 ‘compares’, of Chen).

Referring to claim 9:

i. Chen teaches:

A method, comprising:

a first processing comprising a plurality of applications (see figure 5, elements 530, 535, 540; column 4, line 59-column 5, line 2; and column 11, lines 5-16 of Chen);

a second processing system to connect said first processing system (see figure 5, element ‘user’ [i.e., smart card] of Chen); and

a dynamic attestation module to connect to said first and second

processing systems, said second processing system to perform dynamic attestation for one of said applications to be executed by said first processing system using said dynamic attestation module, wherein said dynamic attestation module comprises an integrity module to dynamically generate a first set of integrity information for said application by generating said first set of integrity information for said application using a cryptographic algorithm system prior to execution of said application by said first processing system (see column 11, lines 5-16, ‘...compares the computed integrity metrics, which it extracts from the challenge response, with the proper platform integrity metric, which it extracts from the certificate.’; and figure 5, element 590 ‘establish secure communication’, of Chen, emphasis added).

However, Chen does not specifically mention the antenna and the transceiver.

Chen discloses dynamic authentication of the platform and application (see column 8, lines 4-16, particularly “Other know processes, for example virus checkers, will typically be in place to check that the operating system and application program code has not been subverted”, of Chen, emphasis added). However, Chen does not specifically mention selecting an application from a plurality of applications.

ii. Nakayama teaches a portable terminal wherein Nakayama discloses the antenna and the transceiver for communicating with other servers (see figure 3, element ‘A’ [i.e., antenna]; and figure 11, elements 23 ‘application receiver’, element 27 ‘value entity transmitter’, of Nakayama).

Nakayama further discloses selecting an application from a plurality of applications (see figure 5, element 222 ‘service identifier area’ [i.e., a plurality of applications]; page 7, paragraph [0102], lines 9-12 “The service identifier area 222 stores identifiers of services (e.g., “0001”, “0002”, “0003”,...) for which the corresponding value entities in the value entity area 221 are used”; and paragraph [0098], lines 7-9 “or pull-type transmission in which the store server 30 transmits the application in response to an active transmission request from the portable terminal 20”, of Nakayama).

iii. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Nakayama into the method of Chen to use an antenna and a transceiver for communicating with other servers.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Nakayama into the method of Chen to select an application from a plurality of applications for authentication.

iv. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to have applied the teaching of Nakayama into the system of Chen to use an antenna and a transceiver, because Chen teaches a method for performing dynamic attestation via integrity metric (see claim 1 above), and Nakayama teaches utilizing integrity measurement in a portable terminal (see e.g. figure 11, element 20 'integrity measurement part' of Nakayama). Therefore, Nakayama's teaching could enhance Chen's teaching by expanding Chen's method for performing dynamic attestation into a portable device.

The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to have applied the teaching of Nakayama into the system of Chen to select an application from a plurality of applications for authentication, because Chen teaches dynamic authentication of platform and applications (see column 8, lines 4-16 of Chen), and Nakayama teaches selection an application from a plurality of applications (see ii). Therefore, Nakayama's teaching could enhance Chen's system by providing flexibility.

Referring to claims 11:

Chen and Nakayama teach the claimed subject matter: a method for performing dynamic attestation (see claim 9 above). They further disclose retrieving a second set of integrity information (see column 11, lines 5-16 '...with the proper platform integrity metric, which is extracts from the certificate.', of Chen).

Referring to claims 12:

Chen and Nakayama teach the claimed subject matter: a method for performing dynamic attestation (see claim 9 above). They further disclose comparing the first set of integrity metric with the second set of integrity metric (see column 11, lines 5-16 'compares', of Chen).

Referring to claims 13:

Chen and Nakayama teach the claimed subject matter: a method for performing dynamic attestation (see claim 9 above). They further disclose the authentication (see column 7, lines 21-26 of Chen).

Referring to claims 14:

Chen and Nakayama teach the claimed subject matter: a method for performing dynamic attestation (see claim 9 above). They further disclose disabling access (see column 11, lines 5-16 ‘...the whole process ends in step 580 with no further communications taking place’, of Chen).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on April 30, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues:

“Applicant respectfully submits that Nakayama clearly fails to teach or suggest the dynamic generation of a first set of integrity information for an application. Because no first set of integrity information is created in Nakayama, Applicant respectfully submits that Nakayama also fails to send said first set of integrity information to a second processing system.” (see page 3, in the middle, Applicant's Arguments/Remarks, emphasis added).

Examiner maintains:

The pending Claims 1, 3-9, 11-15, 17-20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Nakayama.

Chen discloses the dynamic generation of a first set of integrity information for an application (see independent claims 1, 7, 9, 15, and 20 above).

Applicant argues:

"Applicant respectfully submits that Chen fails to disclose the dynamic attestation of an application as argued by the Office Action at page 3." (see page 3, last paragraph, Applicant's Arguments/Remarks, emphasis added).

Examiner maintains:

Chen discloses "In step 530, the trusted device 24 receives the challenge and creates an appropriate response. This may be a digest of the measured integrity metric and the nonce, and optionally its ID label [i.e., dynamically generate a first set of integrity information]. Then, in step 535, the trusted device 24 signs the digest, using its private key, and returns the signed digest, accompanied by the certificate 350, to the user.

In step 540, the user receives the challenge response and verifies the certificate using the well known public key of the TP. The user then, in step 550, extracts the trusted device's 24 public key from the certificate and uses it to decrypt the signed digest from the challenge response. Then, in step 560, the user verifies the nonce inside the challenge response. Next, in step 570, the user compares the computed integrity metric, which it extracts from the challenge response, with the proper platform integrity metric, which it extracts from the certificate. [i.e., generating an attestation value] If any of the foregoing verification steps fails, in steps 545, 555, 565 or 575, the whole process ends in step 580 with no further communications taking place." (see column 10, line 66-column 11, line 16 of Chen).

Therefore, Chen discloses dynamic authentication or attestation.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph Pan whose telephone number is 571-272-5987.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached at 571-272-3859. The fax and phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

Joseph Pan
July 11, 2008
/Hosuk Song/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2135